Mori et al. U.S.S.N. 08/726,613 Page 4

- 77. The method of claim 70 wherein the photoresist is a chemically-amplified positive-acting resist.
 - 78. The method of claim 70 wherein the photoresist is a negative-acting resist.

Please cancel claims 28-46 without prejudice.

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the further indication of allowable subject matter, i.e. that 1, 4-15, 18-20, 22-27 and 47-49 are allowable, and that none of the claims are rejected over prior art.

Claim 50 has been amended, claims 60-78 have been added, and claims 28-46 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments or new claims. For instance, the amendment of claim 50 was requested in the Office Action. The new claims correspond to the claims cancelled herein and original claims 16 and 17.

It is also believed the amendments are properly entered at this time pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 because the amendments do not require a new search or raise new issues, and they reduce issues for appeal. For instance, the new claims were presented in the previous amendment, and have been re-presented to obviate a rejection under Section 112, second paragraph. It is also believed the amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments at this time is earnestly solicited.

Claims 28-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As grounds for the rejection, it is noted that claims 28-46 are dependent upon cancelled claims 16 and 17.

Mori et al. U.S.S.N. 08/726,613

Page 5

By amendments made herein, claims 28-46 have been cancelled without prejudice and re-

presented as new claims, dependent on newly added independent claims that correspond to

original claims 16 and 17. It is believed these amendments obviate the rejection.

It is also noted that claims drawn to methods of forming an image were originally

restricted. See paper no. 3 dated 10/14/97. If so requested by the Examiner, the method claims

herein will be cancelled from the present application and instead prosecuted in a separate

divisional application. However, it is believed that resources and expense will be conserved by

considering and proceeding to allow in the present application the method claims of the distinct

grouping.

Claims 50-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Addition of exposure

and development step to the claims is requested in the Office Action.

To expedite prosecution, claim 50 has been amended as requested in the Office Action. It

is thus submitted that the rejection is properly withdrawn.

It is believed the application in condition for immediate allowance, which action is

earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)

DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS

& CUSHMAN, LLP

130 Water Street

Boston, MA 02109

(617) 523-3400